

2



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/806,549	06/25/2001	Stephane H. Maes	YOR9-1999-01	1159

46069 7590 04/05/2006
F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLC
130 WOODBURY ROAD
WOODBURY, NY 11797

EXAMINER

OPSASNICK, MICHAEL N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2626

DATE MAILED: 04/05/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/806,549

Applicant(s)

MAES, STEPHANE H.

Examiner

Michael N. Opsasnick

Art Unit

2626

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 December 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Upon further review of applicant's presented papers received on 11/14/2005 and 12/12/05, the finality of the Office Action dated 9/8/05 is removed, and Prosecution on the Merits is reopened.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Logan et al (5721827) in further view of Ladd et al (6269336) in further view of Bromberg et al (6529889).

As per claim 1, Logan et al (5721827) teaches:

“ a system for conversational navigation comprising: a server comprising.....server” as server containing HTML web pages and FTP server (Fig. 1, subblock 101).

And a client (Fig. 1, subblock 103) accessing information thru an ISP (Fig. 1, subblock 121) downloading the document with the associated and needed information (col. 8 lines 45-63).

However, Logan et al (5721827) does not explicitly teach allowing the user to activate the content pages of use the logic to access dialog services, however, Ladd et al

Art Unit: 2626

(6269336) teaches the allowance of the user to access the dialog service and content pages via a server (col. 9 lines 1-10, wherein the mentioned application server for web pages accesses the content servers to pull-up the associated information – col. 10 line 60 – col. 11 line 11). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of distributed services at the time the invention was made to modify the accessibility of Logan et al (5721827) information structure with user based allowance to content pages and dialog services because it would advantageously allow for access to such information using almost any type of network access device (Ladd et al (6269336), col. 2 lines 40-47).

The combination of Logan et al (5721827) in further view of Ladd et al (6269336) does not explicitly teach the content to be in a hierarchical document structure, however, Bromberg et al (6529889) teaches the content to be in a structured document, with associated links, to be used by the user (abstract, and col. 5 lines 25-55). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of content providers to modify the combination of Logan et al (5721827) in further view of Ladd et al (6269336) with document based hierarchical content because it would advantageously allow the user to disseminate user information, and that particular content of useful information (Bromberg et al (6529889), col. 11 lines 35-41).

As per claims 2,23, the combination of Logan et al (5721827) in further view of Ladd et al (6269336) teaches accessing the document with associated links (Logan et al (5721827), col. 10 lines 20-30; col. 9 lines 13-21; col. 29 lines 40-60).

As per claims 3,4,19,20 the combination of Logan et al (5721827) in further view of Ladd et al (6269336) in further view of Bromberg et al (6529889) teaches the HTML format (Logan et al (5721827), Fig. 1, subblock 129) capable of speech output (Logan et al (5721827), fig. 6, subblock 421-441) for the client to process the speech (Col. 3 lines 13-19).

As per claims 5-13,22, the combination of Logan et al (5721827) in further view of Ladd et al (6269336) in further view of Bromberg et al (6529889) teaches a dialog interface between the user and the service provided, with content tables and user logs (Logan et al (5721827), col. 15 line 41 – col. 16 line 56).

As per claims 14-18,21,24-26, the combination of Logan et al (5721827) in further view of Ladd et al (6269336) in further view of Bromberg et al (6529889) teaches different levels of access to the user (Logan et al (5721827), Col. 17 lines 22-29; col. 18 lines 11-35), via the server/client architecture (Fig. 1).

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Examiner notes the introduction of the Bromberg reference to address applicant's concerns regarding the claim limitations pertaining to a hierarchical structured document with content.

Art Unit: 2626

Conclusion

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Opsasnick, telephone number (571)272-7623, who is available Tuesday-Thursday, 9am-4pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Richemond Dorvil, can be reached at (571)272-7602. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

mno
4/1/2006


RICHEMOND DORVIL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER